Metadiscourse Markers In English Dissertation Abstracts

by M.saibani Wiyanto, Fabiola Kurnia Dharmawati Suwono

Metadiscourse Markers in English Dissertation Abstracts

Muhammad Saibani Wiyanto, Fabiola Kurnia Dharmawanti and Suwono Suwono

Pasca UNESA, Surabaya State University, Surabaya, Indonesia

{msaibaniw, fabkurnia, nanosuwono}@gmail.com

Abstract: The research aimed to explore metadiscourse categories and types in English dissertation abstracts of Doctoral students'. It represented a qualitative research with the content analysis of English dissertation abstracts in Doctoral students'. The data was 71 English abstracts from 2007 until 2016. It should be selected 36 abstract from Indonesia concentration department and 35 abstracts from English concentration department. They have been graduated from Doctoral Program in Language and Literature education program. The result shows the English dissertation abstract writer applied categories of metadiscourse model in their research. In interactive categories, many researches use transitions type more dominant than other types in both concentration. And they rarely use *endhopric markers* and *evidential* types. While, in the interactional categories, many researches applied engagement markers more dominant than other types. However, they rarely use *attitude markers and self-mentions* types at the abstracts. The study can help learners develop metadiscourse effectively in writing especially abstract section in research.

1 INTRODUCTION

Abstract is significant component of the research. It has some part in the form. All the parts conceive resources use of metadiscourse. It indicates on the interactive and interactional metadiscourse. Metadiscourse represented to make clear what writer want to share to the readers or listener.

Metadiscourse is a widely used term in current discourse analysis and language education, referring to an interesting, and relatively new, approach to conceptualizing interaction between text producers and their texts and between text producers and users (Hyland, 2005:1). Metadiscourse as an important means of facilitating communication, supporting a position, increasing readability and building a relationship with an audience has been proven by some researchers such as metadiscourse in casual conversation, school textbooks (Crismore, 1989), oral narratives, science popularizations, undergraduate textbooks (Hyland, 2000), postgraduate dissertations (Bunton, 1999; Hyland, 2004; Swales, 1990) and company annual reports (Hyland, 1998).

According the explanation and the past investigation above, An Abstract provides some information about how the writer gives their perspective or the result of their research easily. Metadiscourse study is relevant with it. To make

reader easily understanding about the writer result of conclusion.

To know metadiscourse resources used in abstract. The article has invertigated to some English Dissertation Absracts.

2 METHODS

The research applied content analysis. First, It is descriptive and explorative since I describe the metadiscourse resources employed in a text, which is in the dissertation abstract section of post gradutae students'. Second the researcher is the key instrument because I collected and analyzed the data by myself (Creswell, 1994:145, 2009:164).

Moreover, the study also focuses on the content analysis since the materials analyzed are in the form of written i.e. dissertation abstracts section in post graduate students'. Besides, this study identifies the meaning reflected and particular characteristic in the use of rhetorical moves and metadiscourse (Ary *et al*, 2010:457).

The data was English Dissertation abstract that they have written and examined. The number of English abstracts is 71 English dissertation abstract samples starting from 2007-2016. Those can be divided 36 of *Indonesia concentration* and 35 of

English concentration. The main criteria of the samples are as follows: The abstract have been examined in a dissertation.

3 FINDING

A summary of metadiscourse categories, types and resources use found in the dissertation abstracts of the 37 post graduate students'from *Indonesia concentration* is as follows.

Table 1: Summary of Metadiscourse Categories and Type.

Indonesian Concentration	Categories									
Move	Interactive					Interactional				
	Transitions	Frame Markers	Endhoporic Markers	Evidentials	Code Glosses	Hedges	Boosters	Attitude Markers	Self Mention	Engagement Markers
1	45	13			1	4	2	2		7
2	32	50			1	3	9			4
3	58	22			7	4	6	1	1	9
4	77	39			11	4	15			20
5	50	10			5	5	9	1		9
Sub total	262	134			25	20	41	4	1	49
Percentage	62,00%	32,00%			6,00%	17,00%	36,00%	3,00%	1,00%	43,00%
Total	421					115				

Table 1 shows that interactive metadiscourse category is dominant. *Transitions* in interactive metadiscourse category frequently occur. Then, *transitions* are dominant in move 4 and move 5. *Frame markers* often occur in Move 2. Then, Move 4 is dominant in the use of *code glosses* (11 resources). There are no *evidentials* in this category. In interactional metadiscourse, the use of *boosters* are dominant. It often occurs in move 4. *Attitude markers* is only 4 resources. *Hedges* frequently appear in move 5. *Self-mention* is only one resources. The biggest usage of resources in interactional metadiscourse is *engagement markers*.

Then, the occurrence of types of metadiscourse in each move is also described. For interactive metadiscourse category, *transitions, frame markers* and *code glosses* exist in all moves. *Frame markers* are in move 1, move 2, move 3 move 4, and move 5. *Endhoporic markers* are not there. *Evidentials* are not used. Meanwhile, for the interactional metadiscourse category, *hedges,* and *boosters are* in move 1, move 2, move 3, move 4 and move 5. *Attitude markers* occur in move 1, move 3, and move 5. Self-mention is only one on move 3. And *engagement markers* are in move 1, move 2, move 3, move 4 and move 5.

Metadiscourse resources used in interactive metadiscourse categories are also varied in *Indonesia concentration*. Metadiscourse resources in *transitions* are always used □ and, though, while, also, whereas, because, thus, then, beside, but, even though, therefore, although, likewise, since, moreover,

furthermore, thought, in addition, meanwhile, also, besides and while. *Frame markers* consist of aim well, focuse, numbering, purpose, now, conclusion, conclude, goal, listing announcing. They have some subtypes. They are discourse goal (e.g. this study is to reveal…, this study aimed(s) to…, the objective of this research is…, the purpose of the study …, the explanation above underlies this study to…, and so on), label discourse stages (it can be concluded that…, the conclusion of this study) and additive relation (the first, the second, then, cycle 1, numbering). In the *Indonesia concentration*. There is not *Endhoporic marker* and *Evidentials*. However, they have *Code glosses*. They are in fact, i.e, that is, or, such as, according, according to, and eg.

Likewise, there are some resources used in each type in interactional metadiscourse category. *Hedges* consist of □ about, often, would, and should. *Boosters* comprise □ found, always, never, know, find, thingking, found, facts, must, and indeed. *Attitude markers* used are □ usually and expected. *Self-mentions* is only one. It is authors'. Then, *engagement markers* are □ assume, applying, analyze, shows, see, needed to, did not, do not, following, see, could, go, consider, must, and classify.

Second, the following is a summary of metadiscourse categories, types and resources use found in the dissertation abstracts from *English concentration*.

Table 2: Summary of Metadiscourse Categories, and Types.

English Concentration										
Move	Categories									
	Interactive					Interactional				
	Transitions	Frame Markers	Endhoporic Markers	Evidentials	Code Glosses	Hedges	Boosters	Attitude Markers	Self Mention	Engagement Markers
1	54	18	1	0	12	15	10	3	1	21
2	34	23	2	0	10	7	4	1	0	14
3	68	20	0	1	12	9	7	3	0	14
4	124	57	5	0	20	30	34	3	6	63
5	54	33	3	0	19	26	13	0	1	24
Sub-Total	334	151	11	1	73	87	68	10	8	136
Percentage	59%	26%	2%	0%	13%	28%	22%	3%	3%	44%
Total	570					309				

Table 2 shows that interactive metadiscourse category is also dominant. *Transitions* are still frequently used. Nevertheless, most of *transitions* are used in move 3 and move 4. *Code glosses* are also dominant in move 4. In move 4, *frame markers* are often applied. *Endhoporic markers are dominant in move 4*. *Evidentials* are the least use of metadiscourse resources. That is only one. In interactional metadiscourse category, *Engagement markers* are frequently used. In move 4, the metadiscourse types always existing are *hedges, boosters,* and *attitude markers*. Then, *self-mentions* occur in move 1, move 2, move 3 and move 5. *Self-mentions* are the least use of metadiscourse resources.

4 DISCUSSION

This study investigates metadiscourse category, types and resources occurrence in the dissertation abstracts section among the samples (*Indonesia concentration and English concentration)*. The results show that the use of interactive metadiscourse tends to be dominant in two concentrations. It means by referring to Hyland's (2005, 2013) metadiscourse, the writers tend to influence the □ reader friendliness of a text, involve the management of information flow and show how they guide the readers by addressing ways of organizing discourse.

Furthermore, in interactive metadiscourse, *transitions* are frequently used between two concentrations which occur in all moves. It is due to the importance of *transitions* that help readers interpret links between ideas (Hyland, 2005; 2013). The writers need *transitions* to add element to an argument, compare and contrast arguments and evidence, and express a result in each move.

However, *Indonesia concentration* and *English concentration* frequently apply transitions in move 4 because this move is dominant. *Indonesia concentration* employs transitions frequently in move 4 because most of them are dominant in explaining move 4. Meanwhile, *English concentration* often use more transitions in move 4 than in move 2 because the writers rarely use in move 2 which all dissertation abstract. Although most of dissertation abstracts comprise move 4, the writers tend to use transition in explaining the results. Two concentration often use transitions in move 5 because among the samples infrequently use move 5.

It is necessary to note here that from two concentrations that *Indonesia concentration* uses of *frame markers* is dominant in move 2 and the so many *English concentration uses* frame markers in move 4. In relation to moves, move 2 is the purpose and scope of the study. Announcing discourse goal is one of the functions of *frame markers* (Hyland, 2005; 2013). Therefore, *frame markers* referring to announce discourse goal are suitable to be employed in move 2. Moreover, although discourse stages are not dominant, it occurs only in move 5 with the resource □ conclude. The rests relating to additive relations are used to show the sequence in mentioning the purpose. *English concentrations* employ *frame markers* at most because all of the abstracts contain move 4 and some of the writers mention more than one result in one abstract.

Endhoporic markers and *evidential*, the least use of interactive metadiscourse between two concentrations, may be due to the components of the abstracts. *Endhoporic markers* refer to other parts of the text and *evidentials* contribute to a persuasive goal by representing an idea from another source (Hyland, 2005; 2013). Nevertheless, abstracts only consist of

five moves (background, purpose, method, result, and conclusion). Although it is possible to be applied such as *Endhoporic markers* □ before… and above…. and *evidentials* □ 0…, the writers need to understand the importance of using those resources in writing an abstract.

Then, the great difference of *code glosses* between two concentrations may be due to the ability of the writers in recovering their intended meaning by giving additional information. In *Indonesia concentration* and *English concentration*, the use of *code glosses* is dominant in move 4 which is the result, the crucial components in abstracts. Therefore, the writers tend to use *code glosses* in move 4 because they need to ascertain the reader understand the writers' intended meaning in their result of their research by rephrasing, explaining or elaborating what has been said.

Interactional metadiscourse is also important in writing dissertation abstracts in as much as it involves the ways writers organize interaction by intruding and commenting on their message (Hyland, 2005, 2013). However, the use of interactional metadiscourse is fewer than interactive metadiscourse. The use of *hedges, boosters,* and *engagement markers* are the most frequent in interactional metadiscourse.

Hedges are one of the most frequent interactional metadiscourse. It is due to the importance of hedges that indicate the writer's decision to recognize alternative voices and viewpoints and so withhold complete commitment to a proposition. *Hedges* also emphasize that the information is an opinion rather than a fact and therefore open that position to negotiation (Hyland, 2005; 2013). *Hedges* often appear in move 4 in *English concentration*. In *Indonesia concentration,* on the contrary, frequently use *hedges* in move 5. It means that *English concentration* tends to emphasize the results; however, the use of hedges in *Indonesia concentration* tends to be used to explain the conclusion.

It is necessary to note here that from two concentration, the use of *boosters* is dominant in move 4. In relation to moves, move 4 is the result, the crucial components in abstracts. *Boosters* emphasize certainty or close dialogue which is to show writers 'confidence in the truth of a particular proposition. Meanwhile, not much used *attitude markers* in both concentrations. It has function to express writer's attitude to proposition or commenting on the status of information, for instance, the importance of something, the interest of something, its appropriateness, and so on (Hyland, 2005; 2013). Therefore, it is important to emphasize the use of

boosters in move 4 since the writers attempt to show their confidence in stating the result of their research and express their attitude related to the result of their studies. While *attitude markers rarely use* in the both concentrations. The number of occurrence which *Indonesia concentration* and *English concentration* apply *boosters* in move 4. And *attitude markers* at least may be due to the number of two concentrations.

For the use of *self-mentions, English concentration* are dominant appearing at most in move 4. It means that the writers in *English concentration* tend to show explicit of author presence in the text related to explain the result section in abstracts. Meanwhile, *engagement markers* are the most use of interactional metadiscourse since explicitly building relationship with reader to create an impression of authority, integrity and credibility may not an easy thing for postgraduate students.

Nevertheless, the variation of metadiscourse resources which is different from and not included in Hyland's (1998, 2005), Farrokhi & Ashrafi's (2009), and Abdi's (2002) study seems due to the following reasons: 1) type of research consisting of method, designed, and instrument of research and 2) the way students express their idea to excerpt their whole thesis and to comment their research findings through the use of linguistic devices.

5 CONCLUSION

On the whole, the use of interactive metadiscourse tends to be dominant in all disciplines. In interactive metadiscourse, transitions and frame markers are often used. However, *English concentration* and *Indonesia concentration* are dominant in the use of transitions and they are also dominant in the use of frame markers. In Interactional metadiscourse, *English concentration* and *Indonesia concentration* are different. English concentration is more dominant in the use of boosters, and attitude markers than *Indonesia concentration*. However, the use of engagement markers often appears in *English concentration* and *Indonesia concentration*. It is also important to note here that some variation of metadiscourse resources found in this research are different from and not included in Hyland's (1998, 2005, 2013) and Farrokhi & Ashrafi's (2009) study. Those resources are □ due to, because of, this study is/was to, this study is designed to, the researcher investigates, this study is conducted to, this study analyzed, the explanation above underlies this study to, based on the data analysis, based on these findings, many, inferred, revealed, embodied, very, obtained,

strengthen, reached, good, poor, bigger, higher, significant(ly), strong, especially, new, great(ly), positive, active, attractive, motivated, advanced, creatively, innovatively, complex☐It seems due to the following reasons: 1) type of research consisting of method, designed, and instrument of research and 2) the way students express their idea to excerpt their whole dissertation and to comment their research findings through the use of linguistic devices.

REFERENCES

Abdi, R. 2002. Interpersonal Metadiscourse: An Indicator of Interaction and Identity. *Discourse Studies*. Vol. 4. No. 2. ISSN 1461-4456: 139-145

Adelaide Writing Centre. 2014. *Writing an Abstract*. Adelaide: The University of Adelaide

Ary, D et al. 2010. *Introduction to Research in Education*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning

Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mix-Method Approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publication Inc.

Crismore, A. 1989. Talking The Readers. Metadiscourse as Rhetorical Act. New York: Peter Lang.

Farrokhi, F and Somayeh A. 2009. Textual Metadiscourse Resources in Research Articles.☐*Journal of English Language*. Volume 52. No.212: 39-72.

.Hyland, K. 1998. Exploring Corporate Rhetoric: Metadiscourse in the CEO's Letter.☐ *Journal of Business Communication*. 35 (2): 224-245.

Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse*. New York, NY 10010.

Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London, New York: Continuum.

Metadiscourse Markers In English Dissertation Abstracts

10 Submitted to University of Warwick
Student Paper
1%

11 Liang Xiao, Liming Deng. "Generic Variation & Private Intention: A Multi-Dimensional Exploration of Book Reviews and Prefaces", Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2018
Publication
1%

12 Aisha Saadi Al-Subhi. "Metadiscourse in online advertising: Exploring linguistic and visual metadiscourse in social media advertisements", Journal of Pragmatics, 2022
Publication
<1%

13 kupdf.net
Internet Source
<1%

14 www.eajournals.org
Internet Source
<1%

15 W.C. NG, J. LEUNG. "DETERMINING THE OPTIMAL MOVE TIMES FOR A GIVEN CYCLIC SCHEDULE OF A MATERIAL HANDLING HOIST", Computers & Industrial Engineering, 1997
Publication
<1%

16 jmrels.journals.ikiu.ac.ir
Internet Source
<1%

17 Ken Hyland. "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing",
<1%

Journal of Second Language Writing, 2004
Publication

| 18 | earsiv.anadolu.edu.tr
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 19 | journals.au.edu.pk
Internet Source | <1 % |